

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/810,020

Applicant(s)

DOWNS, ROBERT  
CHARLES

Examiner

Dr. Kailash C. Srivastava

Art Unit

1651

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dr. Kailash C. Srivastava, Examiner.

(3) Mr. C. Saponfield, Applicant's Representative.

(2) Mr. Michael Wityshyn, Supervisory Examiner.

(4) Mr. Tim Smith.

Date of Interview: 02 October 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: None.

Claim(s) discussed: Those of Record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Roberts' teachings in regard to Claim 1.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative has presented arguments that the Restriction Requirement in Office Action mailed 03/19/2003 should be re-considered and withdrawn. Mr. Wityshyn will review said restriction requirement, rejection under 112 second paragraph and 103 (a) with regards to Roberts' teachings of the limitations of Claim 1 in Office Action mailed July 01, 2003 and talk to applicant's representative next week. .